

Remarks

1. Claim Status

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-12, 14-23, 25-28, and 30-34 remain pending.

Claims 1, 12, 23, 28, and 33 are independent.

Claim 5 is cancelled herein.

Applicant submits new dependent claims 35-48 for consideration. No new matter has been added.

2. Rejections based on a Combination of Harrington (U.S. 4,939,644) and Fischer (U.S. 4,783,730).

The Final Office Action mailed 11/29/06 rejected claim 1, prior to its current amendment, as obvious over Harrington in view of Fischer. In particular, the rejection relied on Fischer as teaching the "memory address identifying a memory location to which the completion status will be written" recited by claim 1 prior to amendment. In particular, the Office Action identifies the Command/Status Doubleword 50a as shown in FIG. 9 as providing the recited "address". While the Command/Status Doubleword 50a does store a Command/Status value (e.g., a "01" done value), storing a value in the Command/Status Doubleword 50a is different than specifying an address to store the value. This is not a trivial distinction. By storing a completion status value at a specified address instead of within a descriptor, completion notifications can be decoupled from a

descriptor. This can, for example, permit asynchronous completion notification and its associated benefits as described in the application.

Independent claims 12, 23, and 28 include a similar limitation. Thus, for at least the reasons above, Applicant requests withdrawal of the claim rejections of independent claims 1, 12, 23, and 28 and their corresponding dependent claims.

The Office Action also rejected claim 33 based on Harrington. Claim 33 recites "initiating executing the commands in a first order" and "indicating a completion status of each command, as each command completes, in the order that it completes, which is different from the first order". As described in Harrington, a command received from a processor can trigger execution of sequence of commands prior to storing return information to registers (15 in FIG. 1). Applicant does not agree that the completion of a sequence of commands causing storage of return information indicating a status is the same as indicating completion status in a different order than the initiation of execution. In other words, this passage of Harrington does not describe initiating execution of a command in DOB (14B in FIG. 1) after the command in DOA (14A in FIG. 1) but storing a return value in DIB (15B in FIG. 1) for the command in DOB before storing the return value in DIA (15A in FIG. 1) for the command in DOA.

For at least the reasons above, Applicant request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 33 and its corresponding dependent claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/29/07

/Robert A. Greenberg/

Robert A. Greenberg
Reg. No. 44,133

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200